



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/446,730	12/27/1999	KATSUSHI SHIO	105081	2812
25944	7590	02/11/2008	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			PRYOR, ALTON NATHANIEL	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1616		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		02/11/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/446,730	SHIO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alton N. Pryor	1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/16/07; 5/18/07.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/18/07</u> .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Applicant's arguments filed 5/18/07 and 7/16/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See argument below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-4 are no longer rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a stable aqueous suspension comprising quizalofop-p-ethyl wherein the beta type crystal is 80% by weight or more plus Sorpol 3353 or Sorpol FL plus Antifoam E-20 or Napco 8034L, does not reasonably provide enablement for the quizalofop-p-ethyl plus all other surfactants and antifoaming agents. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make / use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Surfactants and antifoam agents differ in chemical and physical properties and therefore it is unbelievable on the face that all other surfactants and antifoaming agents besides (Sorpol FL, Sorpol 3353, antifoam E-20, Napco 8034L) will stabilize quizalofop-p-ethyl where 80% or more is present as the beta crystal.

Response to Applicants' argument

Applicant is correct in that claims can remain broad with respect to surfactants and antifoaming agent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al (USPN 5691276; 11/25/97). Ito discloses examples of suspension compositions comprising 4 parts quizalofop-ethyl, 20.5 parts surfactant, and 23.5 parts water. See column 14 example 44. Ito does not teach the composition comprising 80% or more of the quizalofop-p-ethyl in the beta crystal form. However, for the surfactants used in the examples, it is obvious that all crystal and isomeric forms of quizalofop-ethyl would work absent a showing of one crystal form being more or less effective than a different crystalline form.

Applicant argues that specification provides comparison between examples 1-5 and comparative examples 1-4. The instant compositions possessing the claimed feature show a remarkably good storage stability in comparison to comparative examples. Applicants' declaration states that Quizalofop-p-ethyl has been found to be more effective than Ethyl (S)-2-[4-(6-chloroquinoxalin-2-yloxy) phenoxy] propionate or quizalofop-ethyl. The declaration also points out that quizalofop-ethyl does not form beta-type crystals. The Examiner argues that stability and viscosity data as well as statements with respect to the properties of quizalofop-p-ethyl provided by the applicants have not been connected to the activity of quizalofop-p-ethyl versus that if

quizalofop-ethyl. In other words, the Examiner agrees that the Applicants have shown physical property (melting point, stability and viscosity) differences between quizalofop-p-ethyl and quizalofop-ethyl. However, the Applicants have not shown that those physical property differences affect the activity of the compound as a herbicide. For this reason the rejection is maintained.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8 of U.S. Patent No. 6664213. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 8 does not recite "the ratio or beta-type crystal to alpha-type crystal is 80% by weight or more" and water, one having ordinary skill in the art would have

understood in light of the specification (column 7 lines 1-54, especially lines 33-42) that the quizalofop-ethyl that the quizalofop-ethyl in the composition of claim 8 encompasses a composition contains quizalofop-ethyl where beta-type crystals to alpha-type crystals in a proportion of 80 wt % or more , more preferably 85 wt % or more, much more preferably 90 wt % or more, surfactant and water. Thus, using the specification as a dictionary in this Obviousness type double patenting rejection analysis, the USP' 213 makes obvious the instant invention.

Telephonic Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alton N. Pryor whose telephone number is 571-272-0621. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Alton Pryor
Primary Examiner
AU 1616